

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO. | FIL | ING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 09/826,498 | 09/826,498 04/04/2001 | | Loralei Marie Brandt | J6497(C) | 3031 |
| 201 | 7590 | 05/20/2003 | | | |
| UNILEVER | - | | EXAMINER | | |
| PATENT DE 45 RIVER R | | NT | YU, GINA C | | |
| | EDGEWATER, NJ 07020 | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | , | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | • | | 1617 DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003 | 15 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| 2 | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advis ry Action | 09/826,498 | BRANDT ET AL. | | | |
| Auvis Ty Action | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Gina C. Yu | 1617 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence address | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED on May 5, 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | oid abandonment of this application application abandonment of this application abandonent which are the states and application are supplied to the states a | ation. A proper reply to a hplaces the application in | | | |
| | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the main | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension on the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | | |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b | • | • | | | |
| (c) ⊠ they are not deemed to place the application is issues for appeal; and/or | , i | rially reducing or simplifying the | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceli | ng a corresponding number of f | inally rejected claims. | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See cotinuation sheet</u> . | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | tion(s): | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | eparate, timely filed amendment | | | |
| 5.☑ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>Se</u> | | dered but does NOT place the | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY t | to issues which were newly | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | •• | • | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: None. | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> . | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>14-17</u> . | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <i>None</i> . | | | | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is | a) approved or b) disapp | roved by the Examiner. | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | $\overline{\Omega}$ | | | |
| | SREENI PRIMA | PADMANABHAN S/16/03 ARY EXAMINER | | | |
| U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01) Advi | sory Action | Part of Paper No. 15 | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/826,498

Art Unit: 1617

No. 2. The proposed amendment will not be entered because they are not deemed to place the application in a better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues. The amendment, even if entered, would not simplify the issue at this case, which is whether combining methacrylamidopropyl dimethylamine-vinylpyrrolidone copolymer (DMAPA-VP) and hydroxy ethyl cellulose, both well known hair holding polymers according to Peffly (US 5985294), would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the present invention. See below, No. 7.

No. 5. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does not place the application in the condition for allowance because the alleged unexpected result of the combination of the polymers is deemed an obvious additive effect of combining two ingredients known for the same purpose and effect. Examiner fully considered the data in specification p. 22 and 23 as applicants pointed out. However, examiner views that the enhanced hair holding properties in combining DMAPA-VP and hydroxy ethyl cellulose are expected additive effects. Examiner also notes that Peffly suggests combining vinylpyrrolidone polymers and hydroxy ethyl cellulose in example formulation III. The weight ratio between PVP/VA copolymer and hydroxy ethyl cellulose is 1: 0.33, which is within the claimed weight range. See Example III.